

□ 1215

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE TERRIFIED OF TRUMPCARE

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are speaking up, and they are absolutely terrified of the Republican healthcare plan, TrumpCare. According to a FOX News poll, two-thirds of Americans disapprove of TrumpCare. That's a FOX News poll.

Why? Because it will take away healthcare from 23 million Americans. For those who still have the good fortune of being able to get insurance, they will pay more for worse care. If you are age 50 to 65, fasten your seatbelts; you are about to pay five times what others will pay for health insurance and for prescription drugs.

Of course, in the Senate, they are crafting their version of TrumpCare in secret, behind closed doors. Nobody knows what is in it. Why? Because they know the American people will reject it.

We know we have got issues we have to deal with in healthcare. No law is perfect, and the ACA is one of those. But my goodness, you cannot do this behind closed doors. We have to do this in public. People need to understand what Congress is doing. We have got to get it right, and we have to do it in the open.

SALUTING THE PHILADELPHIA ORCHESTRA ON ITS HISTORIC ASIAN TOUR

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the Philadelphia Orchestra on a historical tour through Asia.

I have had the privilege of working to support them over the years during my time in the Pennsylvania Legislature and now here in Congress. I can't think of a better cultural ambassador for our country, the Commonwealth, and our great city than the finely tuned Philadelphia Orchestra.

The historical tour started in Shanghai, China, where they serenaded the visitors of the new Shanghai Disney Resort. They continued on to Beijing and Mongolia.

Philadelphia's magnificent orchestra marked a historical first when they became the first Western orchestra to play at the people-to-people exchange. The President of Mongolia and I met last year in the city of Philadelphia.

The orchestra then continued on to Seoul and to Hong Kong. In Seoul, the orchestra participated in a master class with the Heart to Heart Orchestra and Korea United College Orchestra. In Hong Kong, the Philadelphia Orchestra concluded with a coaching session for the Hong Kong Youth Orchestra and a well-earned reception.

I would like to give special recognition to the Philadelphia Orchestra's director, the chairman, as well as the woman who brought it all together, Allison Vulgamore.

I am proud to represent a city that boasts some of the most iconic music heard around the world. I welcome back our well-traveled Philadelphia Orchestra and look forward to the next symphony.

VA ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight Congress' making more important strides on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

The last few years, we have all heard stories about employees at the VA who failed in their duty to serve and protect our Nation's heroes. It is true that most VA employees are hardworking and dedicated, but as we have come to find out, there are bad actors who must be held accountable. Our veterans deserve nothing less.

Strangely, as the VA has tried to discipline these bad actors, the existing bureaucracy and red tape has stymied the Secretary's ability to do so. That is why the House today will pass the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, to create a more efficient and effective system to remove, demote, or suspend any VA employee for poor performance or misconduct.

Our bill still ensures due process and actually expands protections for whistleblowers, but, importantly, it will let the VA Secretary do his job and clean up the Department and protect our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, protecting those veterans isn't a political issue; it is a cause we must all champion. I encourage a bipartisan vote on today's bill.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 13, 2017, at 11:23 a.m.:

Appointment:
Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff
Commission on Native Children.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RESIGNATION AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2017.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I, Jason Chaffetz, am submitting my resignation as the Chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform effective immediately. It has been the privilege of a lifetime to serve in this position, and I look forward to continuing to serve as a member of this historic committee for the remainder of my time in office.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 381

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Rutherford.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Gowdy, Chair.

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, ranked as follows on the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Chaffetz, after Mr. Jordan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2581, VERIFY FIRST ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1094, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 378 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 378

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2581) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit. All points of order against

consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 1094) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides for debate on the final negotiated bill between the House and the Senate. This process began last Congress and resulted in the House passing H.R. 1259 in March of this year.

The Senate introduced and passed the version of the bill we have before us today by voice vote. It mirrors the reforms contained in Chairman ROE's bill that the House has already passed by a bipartisan vote.

Mr. Speaker, we often talk about veterans in this country: We thank them for their sacrifice; we applaud them at sporting events; we tell ourselves that we must take care of them, must repay them for the service to our Nation. But in the past few years, we have discovered that America's care for our veterans has been wholly inadequate. The Department of Veterans Affairs has failed them.

Shameful misconduct at the VA has been rampant, and it has hurt our veterans:

In 2014, we learned that the Phoenix VA concealed extremely long wait lines for patients and that up to 40 vets may have died while waiting for care at the facility;

Just last year, we discovered that a VA Hospital in Colorado Springs also falsified wait time records. The majority of patients at that hospital faced wait times over 30 days, and 28 patients had an average wait time of 76 days. One veteran is even thought to have committed suicide because he wasn't referred for mental healthcare, even though he had been deemed at risk for suicide.

That is why Congress needs to act. S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017, allows the Secretary of the VA to hold all employees at the agency accountable for their conduct.

We desperately need this legislation, not because all the employees at the VA have problems. Quite the opposite. Most VA employees show up to work every day because they are passionate about serving our Nation's veterans. But there are bad apples, people who put our veterans in danger. These people must be held accountable, and, frankly, many of them must be fired.

This bill empowers the Secretary to reprimand, suspend, or remove VA employees who have engaged in misconduct. It also permits the Secretary to recoup bonuses if an employee performed poorly or conducted themselves inappropriately and to recoup relocation expenses for fraud, waste, or malfeasance.

The bill also bolsters protection for whistleblowers, creating an office within the VA devoted to protecting those who expose wrongdoing. Supervisors will be taught how to protect whistleblowers and will be held accountable for how well they do.

And the bill requires reporting to Congress on the performance of senior executives at the VA and on the outcomes of disciplinary actions at the agency.

You may be wondering why Congress has taken such an in-depth interest in an executive branch agency, and I will tell you why. It is our job.

The legislative branch was designed to oversee the executive branch. We appropriate the funds used to pay the salaries of everyone working at the VA. These funds come from the taxpayer. For the sake of the taxpayer, we must ensure that the VA is serving its purpose.

But this bill also empowers the Secretary of the VA, allowing him or her to take immediate action to protect veterans. We can't wait for long appeals processes when a bad employee on the front lines of a VA hospital is harming our veterans.

This legislation should not be controversial. Both Democrats and Republicans want the best for our veterans. This legislation, the legislation we are discussing today, gives the VA Sec-

retary and Congress more tools to hold employees accountable because if we are holding employees accountable, then we are protecting our veterans from abuse.

This bill is one small way to say thank you to those men and women who have served our country. We can never adequately repay them, but we can do our best to provide them with sufficient medical care.

I urge you to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, for yielding me the necessary and customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to debate the rule for consideration of two separate pieces of legislation: S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act; and H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act.

I begin with S. 1094, legislation aimed at bringing enhanced accountability at the Department of Veterans Affairs and improving the care we provide to our Nation's veterans. Among other things, this bill codifies in law the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection at the VA and streamlines the process to demote, remove, or suspend VA employees if evidence proves they engaged in misconduct or poor performance.

Mr. Speaker, last night at the Rules Committee, we had the opportunity to hear from the chairman and ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee about this legislation, Dr. ROE and Mr. WALZ. They discussed the bipartisan nature in which they have worked on this issue, along with the bipartisan work done in the Senate, to craft legislation that they hope can achieve strong bipartisan support in this body.

It is because of this display of bipartisanship and cooperation and a semblance of regular order that I am dismayed that I must now address the process and substance by which we are considering the second bill encompassed in this rule, H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act.

□ 1230

Let me connect the dots for you on how we got to this point, and bear with me. The Republican majority's path to take healthcare from 23 million Americans has been as convoluted as it has been chaotic.

Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you and my colleagues should remember, first, the Republican mantra was repeal. Then it was repeal and replace. Then it was repeal and delay, followed by access to coverage, and then, patient centered.

Finally, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle settled on a three-bucket strategy. The first bucket of this strategy was the Republicans'

American Health Care Act. The majority brought their first iteration of this bill to the floor after working on it for 17 days, and, with no hearings, only to have it go down in flames in the most public and spectacular fashion.

So they went back to the drawing board—not to improve the bill, or improve healthcare for the American people, mind you, but to garner enough Republican votes for a bill that ultimately had 17 percent approval ratings. And they added a manager's amendment to get support, then they added another manager's amendment, then another, and another.

Then with a bill patched together with the wants and wishes of powerful healthcare lobbyists and tax breaks for the superwealthy, with no CBO score, and with no way for the American people, let alone their own Members, to actually know what was in the bill, the majority pushed the bill through the House of Representatives.

What did my Republican friends do after passing this inexplicably bad bill? They got on a couple of buses from here at the Capitol and went to a rose garden ceremony hosted by President Donald John Trump to celebrate upending one-sixth of the American economy and taking away healthcare from 23 million people.

That was certainly the Republicans' most recent mission-accomplished moment, and it must have been some celebration because it will be another 2 weeks before the majority would actually get around to sending their healthcare bill to the Senate, due to the fact that they were not sure if it complied with the Senate rules or, more specifically, the Byrd rule in the U.S. Senate.

Then there is the second bucket of this plan, which involves the Trump administration rolling back regulations. Should the work associated with the second bucket proceed as it has with the other two, then I am sure it, too, will be a disaster, benefitting the wealthy at the expense of hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the Republicans' third bucket. According to Senator TED CRUZ, this bucket is "a sucker's bucket." Indeed, some like Senator TOM COTTON have referred to all of this bucket talk as simply a bunch of political spin. Whatever it is, it is an empty bucket.

The most recent bill the Republican majority has decided to dump in this sucker's bucket is H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act. Under current law, premium assistance tax credits are available for eligible individuals and families to subsidize the cost of health insurance. Individuals are not eligible for these credits unless they are U.S. citizens or are living in the country legally.

Currently, applicants have 90 days to provide documentation or otherwise address any issues with citizenship and immigration status, and are presumed eligible to enroll in marketplace coverage. If an individual is unable to pro-

vide the necessary documentation, coverage and financial assistance are terminated.

This provision ensures that individuals are not left in a position of having to wait potentially months to be verified before they can afford coverage, and it provides the proper guardrails to terminate assistance if an individual is deemed ineligible. There is no evidence to support the majority's claim that this process is not working.

H.R. 2581 would repeal this 90-day verification period, setting up an unnecessary barrier for eligible individuals to receive the credits they need to afford lifesaving healthcare. Republicans themselves acknowledge that the verification process could take months, but, nevertheless, they are bringing forth today's bill knowing full well that it will make it harder for vulnerable people to access healthcare when they need it most.

It would disproportionately hurt low-income Americans, especially naturalized Americans from immigrant families since they can have a harder time producing documentation needed to verify their citizenship. But don't just take my word for it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by dozens and dozens of national, State, and local civil rights and advocacy groups strongly opposing this legislation, such groups as the NAACP, the Children's Defense Fund, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, the American Friends Service Committee, the Association of Asian Pacific Community Health Organizations, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Institute of the Sisters of Mercy, and I could go on, and on, and on, but in the interest of time, I thank the Speaker for allowing it to be made a part of the RECORD.

JUNE 12, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As national, state, and local organizations concerned about immigrant rights or access to affordable health care, we are writing to strongly urge you to VOTE NO on H.R. 2581, the "Verify First" Act. This bill is an attack on people's ability to see a doctor and on immigrants and people of color. It is not the "common sense" taxpayer protection bill that its supporters would have you believe.

H.R. 2581 is a dangerous bill that puts up roadblocks for both citizens and immigrants to obtain timely, affordable health insurance. It would strip away provisions that provide for a person to obtain subsidies for enrollment in an Affordable Care Act (or the contemplated American Health Care Act) plan while they work with Department of Health and Human Services to verify their U.S. citizenship or immigration status. The people most impacted are U.S. citizens who were born abroad or naturalized. The bill also affects many immigrants, especially those newly arrived or certain victims of domestic violence and trafficking survivors.

The fact is that when individuals are not able to immediately verify their citizenship or immigration status on an Affordable Care Act Marketplace, it begins an often months long, strenuous process of sending in documents that must be physically inspected. Health care assisters routinely say these cli-

ents are the hardest cases they work on because the process for verifying citizenship and immigration status is a time-consuming exercise in dealing with inefficient government processes.

Rather than protect American taxpayers, H.R. 2581 would strip from American taxpayers important protections that are needed to overcome deficiencies in federal government databases. Immigrants who are not lawfully present are categorically barred from enrollment in health insurance on the Affordable Care Act marketplaces, and for the subsidies that make that insurance affordable. Moreover, safeguards protecting taxpayers are already built into the ACA; individuals whose citizenship or immigration status cannot be verified already are required to pay back all of their subsidies when they file their taxes and "reconcile" their premium tax credits.

Supporters of this bill cite a sloppy Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee report that arrived at a made-up number of supposed "fraud." It's just not true. The committee assumed that every person who lost coverage for failure to verify their citizenship and immigration status was undocumented. In the experience of our organizations and organizations we work with, this is false. These reports describe the first year of the marketplaces, and it is well documented that system outages and understaffing, among other technical problems, contributed to the federal Marketplace's failure to verify consumers' status promptly. The Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General reported in 2014 that a cause of the delay in verification was the agency's lack of prioritization of this issue.

Despite huge gains since then, problems still persist. The Social Security database holding many citizens' information may not reflect common changes, such as when a person marries and changes their last name, or when someone naturalizes and gains U.S. citizenship. People lose their coverage because they receive notices in languages they cannot read. Immigrants are required to submit documents multiple times, or wait while the Department of Homeland Security finds paper files, a result of deficiencies in their databases affecting groups like asylum applicants and some survivors of domestic violence. These are among the many issues consumers face.

Congress has already deprived undocumented immigrants from the ability to buy coverage, even at full price, so they can see a doctor when they are sick, but this bill would go a step further to delay or put out of reach affordable health insurance for many citizens and lawfully present immigrants. Our organizations firmly believe that this would be detrimental to the people we represent and to all of our communities as a whole. We have seen that when health insurance is unaffordable, people are effectively prevented from obtaining access to the care they need to be healthy.

This bill is not just an attack on our health care system, it is also an attack on immigrants and people of color, which our organizations stand firmly against. In his statements when introducing this bill, Rep. Lou Barletta focused the bill as part of his effort to "stop illegal immigration." Rep. Barletta has a long history of anti-immigrant rhetoric, from trying to prevent immigrants from leasing a residence to stating that they should be denied life-saving services in hospital emergency rooms. This bill is simply a vehicle for scapegoating immigrants and people of color and will keep eligible people from accessing health care.

We the undersigned organizations urge you to vote NO on H.R. 2581 and the continued assault on immigrants and the health of our communities.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL

Advocates for Youth; African American Ministers in Action; American Federation of Teachers (AFT); American Friends Service Committee; American Intercession; American Society on Aging; Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum; Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC; Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence; Asian Pacific Partners for Empowerment, Advocacy & Leadership (APPEAL); Association of Asian Pacific Community Health Organizations (AAPCHO); Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Breast Cancer Action; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Center for Medicare Advocacy, Inc.; Child Welfare League of America; Children's Advocacy Institute; Children's Defense Fund; Church World Service (CWS).

Coalition on Human Needs; Columbian Center for Advocacy and Outreach; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, US Provinces; Conscious Talk Radio; Detention Watch Network; Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund; Dominican Sisters; Dominicans of Sinsinawa; Family Equality Council; Farmworker Justice; First Focus Campaign for Children; Food Research & Action Center; Franciscan Sisters of the Poor IJPC; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Generations Inc.; GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBT Equality; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Indivisible; Institute of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas; Interfaith Worker Justice.

Irish Apostolate USA; Jobs With Justice; Justice in Aging; Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Commission, Priests of the Sacred Heart, US Province; Lambda Legal; Leadership Team of the Pelican Sisters of North America; League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC); Medical Mission Sisters; Mi Familia Vota; MomsRising; NAACP; NAPAFASA; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum; National Association of County and City Health Officials; National Association of Social Workers; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA); National Council of Churches.

National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Health Law Program; National Hispanic Medical Association; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Justice for Our Neighbors; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Network of Abortion Funds; National Organization for Women; National Women's Health Network; Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; NMAC; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; Our Revolution; Peace and Justice Office of the Congregation of Notre Dame; Physicians for Reproductive Health; PICO National.

Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Poor People's Economic Human Rights Campaign; Prevention Institute; Project Inform; Racine Dominicans; Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need; Refuge Ministries; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Service Employees International Union; Sisters of Charity; Sisters of Charity of Nazareth; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas—Institute Justice Team; South-

east Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; United Sikhs; United We Dream; Ursuline Sisters of Tildonk, U.S. Province; We Belong Together; API Wellness.

STATE AND LOCAL

Academy of Medical & Public Health Services; Advocates for Children and Youth; AgeOptions; Almost Home, Inc.; Anti-Hunger & Nutrition Coalition; Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families; Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Los Angeles; Asian Community Alliance—Cincinnati OH; Asian Law Alliance; Asian Services In Action, Inc.; Baltimore Jewish Council; California Health Professional Student Alliance; California Immigrant Policy Center; California Latinas for Reproductive Justice (CLRJ); California OneCare; California Pan-Ethnic Health Network; California Partnership; California Physicians Alliance; CASA.

Center for Southeast Asians; Chicago Hispanic Health Coalition; Child Care Resources of Rockland; Children Now; Children's Defense Fund—CA; Chinatown Service Center; Chinese-American Planning Council; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Collaborative Center for Justice; Colorado Center on Law and Policy; Colorado Center on Law and Policy; Columbia Legal Services; Community Health Councils; D.C. Hunger Solutions; DuPage Federation on Human Services Reform; Empower Missouri; Ensuring Opportunity Campaign to End Poverty in Contra Costa; Erie Benedictines for Peace; Esperanza Health Centers; EverThrive Illinois; Farmworker Association of Florida.

Florida Immigrant Coalition (FLIC); Give for a Smile; Greater Kansas City Coalition to End Homelessness; Having Our Say Coalition; Health Access California; Health Care for All—WA; Health Law Advocates; Healthy House Within A MATCH Coalition; Hmong Ohio of Tomorrow; Hunger Action Los Angeles; IHM Sisters, Immaculata, PA; IL Hunger Coalition; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Indivisible Mountain Home, Idaho; Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity; IRIS—Integrated Refugee & Immigrant Services; Islamic Civic Engagement Project; Jewish Family & Children's Service; Kansas Appleseed; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Korean Community Services of Metropolitan NY; La Fe Policy Research and Education Center.

La Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program; Legal Council for Health Justice; Legal Services of Southern Piedmont; Maine Consumers for Affordable Health Care; Make the Road New York; Maryland CASH Campaign; Maryland Hunger Solutions; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA); Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Maternal and Child Health Access; Maternity Care Coalition; National Association of Social Workers, CT Chapter; National Tongan American Society; Nationalities Service Center; NC Child; New Mexico Center on Law and Poverty; New York Immigration Coalition; New York Legal Assistance Group; NICOS Chinese Health Coalition; NJ State Industrial Union Council; NOELA Community Health Center; Northern NJ Chapter, National Organization for Women.

Northwest Health Law Advocates; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project; Office of the Health Care Advocate at Vermont Legal Aid; OneAmerica; Pacific Islander Health Partnership; Pitkin County Human Services; Public Justice Center; Puget Sound Advocates for Retirement Action (PSARA); Rainbow Center; Reformed Church of Highland Park; RESULTS—Santa Fe (NM); Salaam Cleveland; Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN); Sisters of Char-

ity of the Incarnate Word, Houston; Sisters of St. Dominic of Blauvelt, NY; Sisters of the Most Precious Blood; Social Justice Committee St. Patrick Church; South Asian Network; Southwest Women's Law Center; St. Francis St Vincent de Paul Society; Tennessee Justice Center; Thai Health And Information Service.

The Children's Partnership; The Latino Health Insurance Program, Inc.; Turning Points; United Way Bay Area; URI Feinstein Center for a Hunger Free America; Vermont Affordable Housing Coalition; Virginia Poverty Law Center; Voices for Vermont's Children; Voz Hispana Cambia Comunitario; Washington Community Action Network; Washington Healthcare Access Alliance; Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO; West Chester Food Cupboard; West Side Campaign Against Hunger; Westlake Chinese Culture Association; Wisconsin Council of Churches; Wisconsin Faith Voices for Justice; Women's Action Movement Washtenaw County, MI; Worksite Wellness LA; Xaverian Brothers; Young Women United.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, "This bill," that letter says, "is an attack on people's ability to see a doctor and on immigrants and people of color."

"H.R. 2581 is a dangerous bill that puts up roadblocks for both citizens and immigrants to obtain timely, affordable health insurance."

If this is what we are in store for with the Republican's third bucket, then it is even worse than a sucker's bucket. It is callous, and it is cruel, and someone described the Vice Presidency once many years ago as a warm bucket of spit.

As my colleague, Congressman RICHARD NEAL, said last night at the Rules Committee, bad process leads to bad product. I agree with Mr. NEAL, and this bill is a perfect example of his salient insight. The provisions in this legislation are contingent upon enactment of the American Health Care Act.

If the American Health Care Act is enacted, this bill would not go into effect. That means we are now considering legislation amending a bill that we have already sent to the Senate, and that the Senate has made clear it has no intention of taking up.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado as well.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act. I helped introduce this legislation with my good friend and colleague, Mr. BARLETTA from Pennsylvania, to ensure illegal immigrants are not able to use healthcare tax credits to purchase health insurance.

Under ObamaCare, the Federal Government paid these tax credits up front on a temporary basis to people before verifying their immigration status. This created a pay-and-chase system where the Federal Government would seek repayment only after it found it had paid out benefits to an illegal immigrant.

This bill puts an end to this taxpayer abuse by requiring the Social Security Administration, or the Department of Homeland Security, to verify the immigration status of every tax credit applicant before the Treasury Department issues a credit.

Texans and hardworking taxpayers around the country already struggle to pay for their healthcare. Their hard-earned dollars should not be used to foot the bill for those who broke the law to come here. My constituents in Texas and American taxpayers deserve better.

I want to thank Congressman BARLETTA for his dedication and continued leadership on this issue, and, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise only to express my real disappointment in the way that this bill has been brought to the floor. Had the majority not insisted on a closed rule, preventing the House from voting on any and all amendments to repair and improve S. 1094, I would have offered an amendment to ensure that it applies in a way that respects the due process rights of Federal workers, and that it would apply only to collective bargaining agreements ratified on or after enactment.

I support the goal of improving accountability at the VA, but I want to make sure it is not done in a way that prejudices and undermines the collective bargaining rights and the due process rights of the workforce.

There are real problems at the VA now, we know. There are 45- to 49,000 vacancies there. There is bureaucratic dysfunction in a lot of places, and all that this bill would do is to change the evidentiary standard of proof from the preponderance of the evidence to substantial evidence in leveling sanctions and discipline against employees.

That is a tiny detail. It is an irrelevant distraction from the massive problems that actually are facing the VA today. So we should be filling these vacancies. We should be improving the function of the VA, but we should not use this or that problem as an excuse to undermine the due process rights of the workforce. That sets a terrible example for the Federal workforce, generally, and it does nothing to repair the underlying problems and inadequacies that are taking place at the VA.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response to my friend from Florida's statement about the second piece of legislation that we are dealing with in this rule, I believe it is our responsibility to the American taxpayer, and we are fulfilling that responsibility. We are expected to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars. This bill ensures that the government only disburses pre-

mium tax credits under the Affordable Care Act, or under the American Health Care Act, to those individuals who are eligible for those tax credits.

Under the ACA, an individual who is not lawfully present in the United States is ineligible from receiving a premium credit. Unfortunately, the ACA also allows the government to hand out the tax credit first and verify later.

This pay-and-chase scheme means taxpayer money is flowing out the door to people who don't meet the requirements for premium tax credits, and much of these funds may not be recouped. In fact, under the ACA, over half a million people who were ineligible for coverage and tax credits received credits.

H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to ensure that any department disbursing payments have first verified the recipient's legal presence with information like Social Security numbers. By requiring this verification, we can confirm that, under both the ACA and AHCA, those who receive credits deserve credits.

With that confirmation, we will ensure that these laws are used as they were intended; that the wishes of the American taxpayer are followed. I urge Members to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Donald John Trump issued an executive order placing a hiring freeze on Federal civilian employees across the executive branch. This executive order, like many of the executive orders this President has issued, failed to take into account the effects it could have on our most vulnerable communities.

Veterans make up one-third of all Federal workers. I am very pleased that one is in my office. She is probably smiling because sometimes Charity probably doesn't think I even know that she is in the office. But she is there and does incredible work.

The Department of Veterans Affairs—a severely understaffed agency serving those veterans—cannot afford a hiring freeze.

This week, Republicans are bringing to the floor bills they claim would improve veterans' lives. If the President and my Republican colleagues are truly committed to our veterans, then they should ensure that reckless hiring freezes do not harm them in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative SCHRADER's bill, H.R. 696, which would prohibit any hiring freeze from affecting the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of

my amendment, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, what we have here today is a rule with one bill that really was worked on in a bipartisan manner—sort of like regular order like we were promised by the Speaker at the outset of this session of Congress—and another bill, which is just more of the same from this majority: creating problems where none existed before.

The fact remains that the Republicans' healthcare bill and overall bucket strategy is a disaster for the American people, and no amount of Rose Garden backslapping is going to change that fact.

Under the Republican plan, 23 million Americans will be kicked off of their health insurance and \$800 billion will be cut from Medicaid. Footnote right there, we hear that the Senate is taking up something. We don't know where and who is doing the taking up, but what I read today is that they are considering a glide path of some kind to cut Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, cutting Medicaid hurts poor people. Whether you glide it or run it over them, either way you look at it, it hurts them, and we need to pay attention to that, particularly if we are doing it to provide for those of us that are better off in our society.

Seventy-five billion dollars will be cut from Medicare, insurance premiums would increase for people ages 60 to 64 by more than \$3,000 a year, and protections for those with preexisting conditions will be eliminated.

I read about a 63-year-old lady who said that all of her conditions are preexisting and she can't afford insurance. H.R. 2581 only adds to this pain by setting up an unnecessary barrier for eligible individuals to get access to healthcare.

But not to worry, under the Republican plan, the 400 highest income families would ultimately get tax cuts averaging around \$7 million a year, and that information comes from the Ways and Means Committee's fact sheet.

Mr. Speaker, I and others here very frequently have pointed out that what the Republicans want to do is to cut benefits for poor people—the most vulnerable in our society—and to provide for the better-off tax cuts—those people in our society who least need them.

It occurs to me that if we were to have an opportunity to ask the 400 wealthiest families in this country whether or not they really need a tax cut, my belief, based on the four billionaires that I have known personally—two are deceased now—but in my conversations with all of them, their position was that they didn't need a cut. To the man, each one of them said that, if they were to receive tax cuts, they would prefer that they go to education, particularly education for kindergarten and prekindergarten.

If my Republican colleagues can move past throwing red meat to their base—a group of people, mind you, who are most certainly disadvantaged—one day they are going to wake up and recognize that much of what we are doing here, even though they support it, many of the persons who are doing it, they, too, are caught up in this downward spiral that is involving healthcare in this country, the game that we are playing.

If we are willing to work in a serious manner to address the issues in our healthcare system, then I know that Democrats are ready to work with Republicans. But whatever is going on in the other body, I assure you, no Democrats in the other body are involved in.

Last night I asked the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee whether or not he knew what this bill looked like, and his answer was that he did not.

I also said what I repeat here, that people are hurting in this country. Whether it is ObamaCare that the Republicans, I believe, are going to find that it is going to be hard to fix, or whether it is the Affordable Care Act that is in some phantom hole over in the other body, somehow or another, my friends on the other side are going to be held accountable for all of what is necessary to be done. The only way that is sensible—and I believe that every American is imploring us to undertake—is to sit down together.

I cannot believe that the 435 people plus 6 here in the House of Representatives and the 100 United States Senators do not have the ability to do all of the things that are necessary in order for Americans to receive adequate healthcare and to lead with protecting the most vulnerable in our society.

It is ridiculous to talk about cutting Medicaid when more than 60 percent of the people on Medicaid are seniors that are in nursing homes.

What are we going to say to those families? How are we going to address them when it comes to the reality that they are confronted with while we are up here jaw jacking back and forth about whether or not it is ObamaCare or whether or not it is the Affordable Care Act that we can't seem to find.

Somewhere along the lines, we need to sit down and work together. Failure to do so is to our own peril and to the peril of the citizens of this great country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here discussing two important bills. One of them fulfills the congressional duty to steward taxpayer dollars well. We shouldn't be handing out tax credits to people without first checking their eligibility for their tax credits. This is common sense.

H.R. 2581, the Verify First Act, will require verification of legal presence in

this country before someone can receive a tax credit. It is only fair to the American people that we pass this legislation.

The other bill in this rule, S. 1094, protects our veterans from harm. We all have a commitment to repaying the men and women who have served this Nation in the military. These brave individuals have put much on the line and sacrificed so much time and opportunity. They deserve the best healthcare.

This legislation holds the VA accountable. We need to empower the VA Secretary to quickly fire employees who put our veterans in danger. We also need the VA to report to Congress so that the legislative branch can fulfill its oversight duties.

I thank the sponsors of these important bills—Senator RUBIO for S. 1094 and Representative BARLETTA for H.R. 2581.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the resolution, and I urge a “yes” vote on the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 378 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 696) to prohibit any hiring freeze from affecting the Department of Veterans Affairs. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 696.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House

being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 189, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—229

Abraham	Gibbs	Olson
Aderholt	Gohmert	Palazzo
Allen	Goodlatte	Palmer
Amash	Gosar	Paulsen
Amodel	Gowdy	Pearce
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Perry
Babin	Graves (LA)	Pittenger
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Grothman	Poliquin
Barletta	Guthrie	Posey
Barr	Harper	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harris	Reed
Bergman	Hartzler	Reichert
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Roe (TN)
Black	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Bost	Huizenga	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rooney, Francis
Brat	Hunter	Rooney, Thomas
Bridenstine	Hurd	J.
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Bucshon	Johnson (LA)	Rothfus
Budd	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Burgess	Jordan	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Joyce (OH)	Russell
Calvert	Katko	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Chabot	King (IA)	Schweikert
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Kinzinger	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	Knight	Sessions
Cole	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Shuster
Collins (NY)	LaHood	Simpson
Comer	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Comstock	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lance	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Latta	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Lewis (MN)	Smucker
Cramer	LoBiondo	Stefanik
Crawford	Long	Stewart
Culberson	Loudermilk	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Tenney
Davidson	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Denham	MacArthur	Tiberi
Dent	Marchant	Tipton
DeSantis	Marino	Trott
DesJarlais	Marshall	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Upton
Donovan	Mast	Valadao
Duffy	McCarthy	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Walden
Dunn	McHenry	Walker
Emmer	McKinley	Walorski
Estes (KS)	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Farenthold	Rodgers	Webster (FL)
Faso	McSally	Wenstrup
Ferguson	Meadows	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Williams
Fleischmann	Messer	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Mitchell	Wittman
Fortenberry	Moolenaar	Womack
Foxx	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Gaetz	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Gallagher	Noem	Young (IA)
Garrett	Nunes	Zeldin

NAYS—189

Adams	Brady (PA)	Cicilline
Aguilar	Brown (MD)	Clark (MA)
Barragán	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Bass	Bustos	Clay
Beatty	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bera	Capuano	Clyburn
Beyer	Carbajal	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Blunt Rochester	Cartwright	Cooper
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Correa
Boyle, Brendan	Castro (TX)	Costa
F.	Chu, Judy	Courtney

Crist	Khanna
Crowley	Kihuen
Cuellar	Kildee
Davis (CA)	Kilmer
Davis, Danny	Kind
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi
DeGette	Kuster (NH)
Delaney	Langevin
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)
DelBene	Larson (CT)
Demings	Lawrence
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)
Deutch	Lee
Dingell	Levin
Doggett	Lewis (GA)
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted
F.	Lipinski
Ellison	Loeb
Engel	Lofgren
Eshoo	Lowe
Espallat	Lujan Grisham,
Esty (CT)	M.
Evans	Lujan, Ben Ray
Foster	Lynch
Frankel (FL)	Maloney,
Fudge	Carolyn B.
Gabbard	Maloney, Sean
Gallo	Matsui
Garamendi	McCollum
Gonzalez (TX)	McEachin
Gottheimer	McNerney
Green, Al	Meeks
Green, Gene	Meng
Grijalva	Moore
Gutiérrez	Moulton
Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)
Hastings	Nadler
Heck	Neal
Higgins (NY)	Nolan
Himes	Norcross
Hoyer	O'Halleran
Huffman	O'Rourke
Jackson Lee	Pallone
Jayapal	Panetta
Jeffries	Pascrell
Johnson (GA)	Payne
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Jones	Peters
Kaptur	Peterson
Keating	Pegree
Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Kennedy	Polis

NOT VOTING—12

Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Napolitano
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
Granger	Lowenthal	Taylor
Griffith	McGovern	Weber (TX)

□ 1321

Mses. JAYAPAL and WILSON of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—229

Abraham	Barletta	Blackburn
Aderholt	Barr	Blum
Allen	Barton	Bost
Amash	Bergman	Brady (TX)
Amodel	Biggs	Brat
Arrington	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Babin	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (IN)
Bacon	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Banks (IN)	Black	Buck

Price (NC)	Bucshon	Hollingsworth	Posey
Quigley	Budd	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Raskin	Burgess	Hultgren	Reed
Rice (NY)	Byrne	Hunter	Reichert
Richmond	Calvert	Hurd	Renacci
Rosen	Carter (GA)	Issa	Rice (SC)
Roybal-Allard	Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Ruiz	Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Ruppersberger	Chaffetz	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Rush	Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Ryan (OH)	Coffman	Jones	Rohrabacher
Sánchez	Cole	Jordan	Rokita
Sarbanes	Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Schakowsky	Collins (NY)	Katko	Rooney, Thomas
Schiff	Comer	Kelly (MS)	J.
Schneider	Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Schrader	Conaway	King (IA)	Roskam
Scott (VA)	Cook	King (NY)	Ross
Scott, David	Costello (PA)	Kinzinger	Rothfus
Serrano	Cramer	Knight	Rouzer
Sewell (AL)	Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Royce (CA)
Shea-Porter	Culberson	Labrador	Russell
Sherman	Curbelo (FL)	LaHood	Rutherford
Sinema	Davidson	LaMalfa	Sanford
Sires	Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Scalise
Slaughter	Denham	Lance	Schweikert
Smith (WA)	Dent	Latta	Scott, Austin
Soto	DeSantis	Lewis (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Speier	DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Sessions
Suozi	Diaz-Balart	Long	Shimkus
Swalwell (CA)	Donovan	Loudermilk	Shuster
Takano	Duffy	Love	Simpson
Thompson (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Thompson (MS)	Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Titus	Dunn	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
Tonko	Emmer	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Torres	Estes (KS)	Marino	Smucker
Tsongas	Farenthold	Marshall	Stefanik
Vargas	Faso	Massie	Stewart
Veasey	Ferguson	Mast	Stivers
Vela	Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Tenney
Velázquez	Fleischmann	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Visclosky	Flores	McClintock	Thornberry
Walz	Fortenberry	McHenry	Tiberi
Wasserman	Foxx	McKinley	Tipton
Schultz	Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Trott
Waters, Maxine	Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Turner
Watson Coleman	Gaetz	McSally	Upton
Welch	Gallagher	Meadows	Valadao
Wilson (FL)	Garrett	Meehan	Wagner
Yarmuth	Gibbs	Messer	Walberg
	Gohmert	Mitchell	Walden
	Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Walker
	Gosar	Mooney (WV)	Walorski
	Gowdy	Mullin	Walters, Mimi
	Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)
	Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Wenstrup
	Graves (MO)	Nunes	Westerman
	Grothman	Olson	Williams
	Guthrie	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
	Harper	Palmer	Wittman
	Harris	Paulsen	Womack
	Hartzler	Pearce	Woodall
	Hensarling	Perry	Yoder
	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger	Yoho
	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)	Young (AK)
	Hill	Poliquin	Young (IA)
	Holding		Zeldin

NOES—190

Adams	Clay	Eshoo
Aguilar	Cleaver	Espallat
Barragán	Clyburn	Esty (CT)
Bass	Cohen	Evans
Beatty	Connolly	Foster
Bera	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Beyer	Cooper	Fudge
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Costa	Gallo
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Garamendi
Bonamici	Crist	Gonzalez (TX)
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Gottheimer
F.	Cuellar	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brown (MD)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Bustos	DeGette	Hanabusa
Butterfield	Delaney	Hastings
Capuano	DeLauro	Heck
Carbajal	Carbajal	Higgins (NY)
Cárdenas	Demings	Himes
Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Cartwright	Deutch	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Doggett	Jayapal
Chu, Judy	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Cicilline	F.	Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY)	Engel	Kaptur

Keating	Meeks	Schneider
Kelly (IL)	Meng	Schrader
Kennedy	Moore	Scott (VA)
Khanna	Moulton	Scott, David
Kihuen	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Kildee	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Kilmer	Neal	Shea-Porter
Kind	Nolan	Sherman
Krishnamoorthi	Norcross	Sinema
Kuster (NH)	O'Halleran	Sires
Langevin	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Larson (CT)	Panetta	Soto
Lawrence	Pascrell	Speier
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Suozi
Lee	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Levin	Peters	Takano
Lewis (GA)	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Pocan	Titus
Loeb sack	Polis	Tonko
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Torres
Lowenthal	Quigley	Tsongas
Lowey	Raskin	Vargas
Lujan Grisham, M.	Rice (NY)	Veasey
Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Vela
Lynch	Rosen	Velázquez
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Carolyn B.	Ruiz	Walz
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Matsui	Rush	Schultz
McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Waters, Maxine
McEachin	Sánchez	Watson Coleman
McGovern	Sarbanes	Welch
McNerney	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
	Schiff	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Pelosi
Cummings	Huizenga	Taylor
Granger	Johnson, Sam	Weber (TX)
Griffith	Napolitano	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1327

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 303.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding a missed vote due to a meeting with constituents on the House steps. Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 303, H. Res. 378, The Rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2581—Verify First Act and S. 1094—Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 302 and No. 303 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2581 and S. 1094. I would have also voted "nay" on H. Res. 378—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2581—Verify First Act and S. 1094—Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to report my absence on the vote of the H. Res. 378, the combined rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2581 and S. 1094, as well as the vote on the previous question. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on

rollcall No. 302 (Previous Question on H. Res. 378), and "yea" on rollcall No. 303 (Adoption of H. Res. 378).

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 166, answered "present" 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—238

Abraham	Duncan (TN)	McMorris
Adams	Dunn	Rodgers
Aderholt	Emmer	McNerney
Allen	Engel	Meadows
Amodei	Estes (KS)	Meehan
Arrington	Esty (CT)	Meeks
Babin	Ferguson	Meng
Bacon	Fleischmann	Messer
Banks (IN)	Portenberry	Mitchell
Barletta	Foster	Moolenaar
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)
Beatty	Gabbard	Moulton
Bergman	Garamendi	Mullin
Bilirakis	Garrett	Murphy (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Goodlatte	Nadler
Bishop (MI)	Gottheimer	Newhouse
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	Noem
Black	Green, Al	Nunes
Blackburn	Guthrie	O'Rourke
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Olson
Blunt Rochester	Harper	Palazzo
Bonamici	Harris	Palmer
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Panetta
Brat	Heck	Pascrell
Bridenstine	Hensarling	Pearce
Brooks (IN)	Higgins (LA)	Perlmutter
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Buchanan	Hill	Pocan
Bucshon	Himes	Polis
Budd	Hollingsworth	Posey
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Huizenga	Reichert
Byrne	Hultgren	Richmond
Calvert	Hunter	Roby
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Roe (TN)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Cartwright	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rooney, Francis
Chabot	Kaptur	Rooney, Thomas J.
Chaffetz	Katko	Roskam
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Ross
Chu, Judy	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Ciavarella	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Clay	King (IA)	Rush
Cleaver	King (NY)	Russell
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Rutherford
Cole	Kuster (NH)	Ryan (OH)
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Scalise
Comstock	LaMalfa	Schneider
Cook	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cramer	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Cuellar	Lipinski	Serrano
Culberson	Long	Sessions
Davidson	Loudermilk	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Love	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lucas	Shimkus
DeGette	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham, M.	Simpson
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (NE)
Demings	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Marino	Smith (TX)
Dent	Marshall	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Massie	Smucker
DesJarlais	Mast	Speier
Deutch	McCarthy	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Stewart
Dingell	McClintock	Suozi
Doggett	McCollum	Takano
Donovan	McEachin	Tenney
Duffy	McHenry	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)		

Titus	Walters, Mimi	Williams
Torres	Walz	Wilson (SC)
Trott	Wasserman	Wittman
Tsongas	Schultz	Womack
Velázquez	Webster (FL)	Yarmuth
Walden	Welch	Young (IA)
Walker	Wenstrup	Zeldin
Walorski	Westerman	

NAYS—166

Aguilar	Gosar	Nolan
Amash	Graves (GA)	Norcross
Barragán	Graves (LA)	O'Halleran
Barton	Graves (MO)	Pallone
Bass	Green, Gene	Paulsen
Beyer	Grothman	Payne
Biggs	Gutiérrez	Perry
Blum	Hastings	Peters
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Brady (PA)	Holding	Poe (TX)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Poliquin
Buck	Hudson	Price (NC)
Burgess	Hurd	Ratcliffe
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Reed
Carbajal	Jayapal	Renacci
Cárdenas	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (NY)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Castor (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Clark (MA)	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Rosen
Coffman	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Cohen	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Comer	Khanna	Sánchez
Conaway	Kihuen	Sanford
Connolly	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kind	Schakowsky
Correa	Kinzing	Schiff
Costa	Knight	Schrader
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Courtney	Lance	Sewell (AL)
Crist	Langevin	Sinema
Crowley	Latta	Smith (MO)
Curbelo (FL)	Lawrence	Soto
Davis, Rodney	Lawson (FL)	Stivers
DeFazio	Lee	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Levin	Thompson (CA)
DeSantis	Lewis (GA)	Thompson (MS)
Doyle, Michael F.	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (PA)
Ellison	LoBiondo	Tipton
Españillat	Loeb sack	Turner
Evans	Lofgren	Upton
Farenthold	Lowenthal	Valadao
Faso	Lowey	Vargas
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Veasey
Flores	MacArthur	Vela
Fox	Maloney, Sean	Visclosky
Franks (AZ)	Carolyn B.	Walberg
Fudge	Matsui	Waters, Maxine
Gaetz	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Gallagher	McKinley	Wilson (FL)
Galleo	McSally	Woodall
Gibbs	Moore	Yoder
Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (PA)	Young (AK)
	Neal	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rice (SC)	Tonko
-----------	-------

NOT VOTING—24

Bera	Grijalva	Royce (CA)
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Sires
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Slaughter
Eshoo	Kelly (IL)	Taylor
Frankel (FL)	Labrador	Tiberi
Gohmert	Napolitano	Wagner
Granger	Pelosi	Weber (TX)
Griffith	Raskin	Yoho

□ 1334

Messrs. RENACCI and CURBELO of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 304.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the initial vote series due to my attendance of